

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-20, 22-26, 28-30, and 32 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 13, and 20 have been amended. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1 and 3-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of claims 1 and 3-12 is fully supported by the specification. More specifically, support for claims 1 and 3-12 can be found on at least page 45, line 20-page 46, line 9 of the application as originally filed. Withdrawal of the § 112 rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-8, and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,652,412 to Lazzouni et al. ("Lazzouni"). Independent claim 1 relates to an electronic reading device. Applicant respectfully submits that Lazzouni fails to teach or suggest at least one of the distinguishing features of amended independent claim 1, namely, the electronic reading device entering into a configuration mode responsive to touching the electronic reading device to an electronic reading device configuration box.

Lazzouni relates to an information recording apparatus for use with paper having a prerecorded pattern of pixels associated with a writing surface. Each of the pixels contains encoded, optically readable position information that identifies an absolute coordinate position on the writing paper. The information recording apparatus comprises a pen to write on the encoded paper, wherein the position of the pen tip is determined by reading the pattern of pixels and storing the position information in the recording unit. In contrast to amended claim 1, in Lazzouni, the pen uses two location detection modes. A first mode for absolute position detection and a second mode for relative position detection. Applicant respectfully submits that the two location detection modes of Lazzouni do not correspond to a configuration mode of the electronic reading device as in amended independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 distinguishes over Lazzouni and is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of amended claim 1 as anticipated by Lazzouni is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 3-8 depend from and further restrict independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 1, dependent claims 3-8 distinguish over Lazzouni and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 3-8 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 20 relates to a method for configuring an electronic reading device. Applicant respectfully submits that Lazzouni fails to teach or suggest at least one of the distinguishing features of amended independent claim 20, namely, wherein the electronic reading device enters into a configuration mode responsive to touching the electronic reading device to an electronic reading device configuration box.

In contrast to amended claim 20, in Lazzouni, a pen uses two location detection modes. A first mode for absolute position detection and a second mode for relative position detection. Applicant respectfully submits that Lazzouni fails to teach or suggest a configuration mode of the electronic reading device as in amended independent claims 20. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 distinguishes over Lazzouni and is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of amended claim 20 as anticipated by Lazzouni is respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 22 depends from and further restricts independent claim 20 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 20, dependent claim 22 distinguishes over Lazzouni and is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 22 is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazzouni in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,990,875 to Bi et al. ("Bi"). Claims 9-12 depend from and further restrict independent claim 1 and therefore also distinguish over Lazzouni. In rejecting claims 9-12, the Examiner has further applied Bi. Bi has been cited as teaching a pen-based computer system that utilizes identification code. Applicant respectfully submits that Bi fails to cure the deficiencies of Lazzouni noted above with respect to independent claim 1. Applicant

respectfully submits that dependent claims 9-12 distinguish over the cited combination of Lazzouni and Bi and respectfully requests that the rejection thereof be withdrawn.

Claims 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazzouni in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,710,832 to Berman et al. ("Berman"). Independent claim 13 relates to a system for initializing an electronic reading device. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Lazzouni and Berman fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claims 13, namely, wherein a portion of an address pattern contained in each one of a plurality of boxes is detected responsive to touching the electronic reading device within the plurality of boxes. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious selecting an associated alphanumeric character responsive to detecting the portion of the address pattern contained in each of the plurality of boxes.

Lazzouni relates to an information recording apparatus for use with paper having a prerecorded pattern of pixels associated with a writing surface. Applicant respectfully submits that Lazzouni fails to disclose a plurality of boxes. Berman discloses character boxes containing symbols and by tapping a pen on the character boxes, a user can select symbols. However, Berman does not disclose detecting a portion of an address pattern contained in each of a plurality of boxes by touching an electronic reading device within the plurality of boxes. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 13 distinguishes over the cited combination of Lazzouni and Berman and respectfully requests that the rejection thereof be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 14 and 15 depend from and further restrict independent claim 13 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 13, dependent claims 14 and 15 distinguish over the cited combination of Lazzouni and Berman and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 14 and 15 is respectfully requested.

Claims 16-19 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Lazzouni, Berman, and Bi. Dependent claims 16-19 depend from and further restrict independent claim 13 in a patentable sense. Dependent claim 23 depends from and further restricts independent claim 20 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits

that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 13 and 20, respectively, dependent claims 16-19 and 23 distinguish over the cited combination of Lazzouni, Berman, and Bi and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 16-19 and 23 is respectfully requested.

Claims 24-26, 28-30, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazzouni and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,307,955 to Zank et al. ("Zank"). Independent claim 24 relates to a system for unlocking an electronic reading device. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Lazzouni and Zank fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 24, namely, enabling the electronic reading device if a data entry corresponds to a stored user identifier.

Zank relates to a system for electronic capture of signatures, binding the signatures to a document or data, and compressing and storing the signatures. In general, Zank relates to a utilization of handwritten signatures in connection with electronically stored, transmitted and retrieved data and documents. In contrast to claim 24, the electronic capture of signatures is for security purposes during e-commerce with the efficiency of automatic computer operations and not for the purpose of enabling an electronic reading device as in claim 24. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 24 distinguishes over the cited combination Lazzouni and Zank and respectfully requests that the rejection thereof be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 25-26 and 28 depend from and further restrict independent claim 24 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 24, dependent claims 25-26 and 28 distinguish over the cited combination of Lazzouni and Zank and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 25-26 and 28 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 29 relates to a method for unlocking an electronic reading device. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Lazzouni and Zank fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 29, namely, enabling an electronic reading device based on a comparison if a data entry corresponds to a stored user identifier.

Zank relates to a system for electronic capture of signatures, binding the signatures to a document or data, and compressing and storing the signatures. In contrast to claim 29, the electronic capture of signatures is for security purposes during e-commerce with the efficiency of automatic computer operations and not for the purpose of enabling an electronic reading device as in claim 29. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 29 distinguishes over the cited combination Lazzouni and Zank and respectfully requests that the rejection thereof be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 30 and 32 depend from and further restrict independent claim 29 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 29, dependent claims 30 and 32 distinguish over the cited combination of Lazzouni and Zank and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 30 and 32 is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: Dec. 21, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ross T. Robinson

Registration No.: 47,031

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL  
CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 855-4500

Attorneys For Applicant